



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,676	08/31/2001	Daniel Keele Burgin	1160215/0474949	8505
26874	7590	06/19/2007		
FROST BROWN TODD, LLC 2200 PNC CENTER 201 E. FIFTH STREET CINCINNATI, OH 45202			EXAMINER MOSSER, KATHLEEN MICHELE	
			ART UNIT 3714	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dbell@fbtlaw.com
dfranklin@fbtlaw.com
rgaunce@fbtlaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/944,676	Applicant(s) BURGIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Kathleen Mosser	Art Unit 3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 37-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 37-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/22/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3714

DETAILED ACTION

In response to the amendment filed 12/12/2006 claims 37-56 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

1. Claims 37-53 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt et al (US 2002/0130895 A1) in view of Jawahar et al (US 6256620 B1). Brandt teaches a method for providing help/support information to user including the steps of: passing a navigation event (the help signal paragraph 29) from a first frame (web page) originating from a first domain (the web file) to a second frame (the help window, paragraph 13) originating from a second domain (the instructions in the computer memory), see paragraphs 36 and 37; determining the present navigation location within the first frame using the navigation event and initiating an automated help session in the second frame, the automated help session corresponding to the determined present navigation location (paragraph 31), as in **claims 37 and 45**. Collecting data from the first frame that was collect from the user in the first frame and passing the received information to the second frame (**claims 39, 42, 47 and 50**) is shown in the tracking of the

Art Unit: 3714

user actions in the web page, see paragraph 45. The web page of Brandt is by definition a content frame, as per **claims 40 and 48**. Brandt et teaches receiving a user request for help (**claim 36**), see Figure 3, element 34.

Brandt fails to specifically teach: displaying the first frame and the second frame in a single web page at the user computer (**claims 37, 45 and 53**); or that the browser is subject to the consistent page domain security requirement (**claim 53**); initiation a live help session and passing the data from the automated help session to the live help session (**claims 38 and 46**); passing a command from the automated support session to the first frame (**claims 41 and 49**); receiving data that was collected in the live help session and passing the data to the first frame (**claims 43 and 51**); receiving data collected from the user in the second frame and passing the data to the live help session (**claims 44 and 52**); and that the user's computer, first Internet domain, and second Internet domain are separate (**claim 53** and newly added to **claims 37 and 45**).

Jawahar et al teaches on online system for providing live support to an end-user. The system teaches collecting all interaction of a user on a web page (content frame) and passing this information to the live support session in at least col. 12: 65 - col. 13:23. These features are substantially similar to the data collection and passing steps not taught by Brandt. The ability for the help session to send information to the user's computer, i.e. passing information from the help session to the content frame, is shown in col. 7: 37-40. The Jawahar et al system monitors all user interactions, which in the combination of the inventions, includes those interactions made with the automated help system of Brandt et al. Separation of each of the various features of Jawahar is taught in at least Figure 2. The use of multiple frames within a web-browser, including one indicating the help session and the other representing the browser location is shown in at least col. 12: 21-64. Jawahar also teaches the use of either the Netscape or Internet Explore browser (see col. 6: 8-21), both of which are known to operate under the consistent page domain security when implemented in a Windows environment. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the live help session features of Jawahar et al with the automated help system of Brandt et al so as to implement a convenient means for a user encountering difficulties with a web page to contact a live representative to gain assistance (Jawahar et al, background).

Art Unit: 3714

Regarding the newly added limitations of **claims 37, 45 and 53**, Brandt fails to explicitly teach that the automated agent monitors one or both of (i) a plurality of subsequent navigation locations of the end-user within the first frame or (ii) a plurality of subsequent navigation events initiated by the endUser within the first frame, wherein the act of monitoring comprises passing the above information to the second frame (automated agent). Jawahar et al teaches a monitoring program which monitors all actions of a user as they browse a website, see col. 13: 9+. This function is used when the invention of Jawahar determines whether to offer the user "help". The information monitored is sent to the live help system of Jawahar et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the monitoring software of Jawahar et al within the automated support system of Brandt et al so as to allow the system to monitor all actions of the user up to and including the specific request for help and allow the system to determine where users were having the most difficulties in navigating a website.

2. Claims 54 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt et al (US 2002/0130895 A1) in view of Jawahar et al (US 6256620 B1), as applied to claims 37 and 38 above, and further in view of Sullivan et al (US 6694314). Brandt et al and Jawahar et al teach all features of the invention as shown above but fail to specifically teach: gathering help data associated with the live help session, updating a knowledge database with the help data, and using the help data from the updated knowledge database in a subsequent automated help session to provide assistance to the end-user (**claim 54**); or masking either a first or second address to create the appearance that the first and second address are the same address (**claim 55**). Sullivan et al teaches a user support system in which the user may receive both automated support and live support. Sullivan teaches keeping a database of help provided to a user, and using this database to further enhance the automated help systems in col. 3: 39-51 and col. 13: 3-28. The masking features are described in col. 7: 31-44. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the features of Sullivan with those of Brandt et al and Sullivan so as to provide a more efficient automated help system, in which users were less frequently required to seek live-help.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 12/12/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Response to Arguments concerning the Domain features

To begin the examiner notes that the specification fails to provide a specific definition regarding the term domain. Although several definitions have been set forth throughout the prosecution history, the interpretation of the claims is not so limited. The examiner further maintains and incorporates by reference the arguments set for in the March 14, 2005 office action which clearly set forth how Brandt teaches multiple domains. Further the examiner notes, that the applicant in the response to the above office action dated 04/26/2005, clearly shows that the amendment to the claims is being made to overcome the examiner's comments, accepted this interpretation. Applicant's attempts to now challenge this point are untimely and improper.

Lastly, applicant's arguments with respect to the Jawahar reference fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Applicant merely asserts that the features of Jawahar are different without providing any supporting logical or rationale which clearly distinguishes the elements of the pending claims.

Response to Arguments concerning the Masking features

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., that the masking is designed to circumvent security) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Art Unit: 3714

Conclusion


THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kathleen Mosser whose telephone number is (571) 272-4435. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Kathleen Mosser
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3714

June 11, 2007